

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/690,670	Applicant(s) IWANAMI ET AL.	
	Examiner Timothy P. Solak	Art Unit 3746	

All Participants:
Status of Application: Allowance

 (1) Timothy P. Solak.

(3) _____.

 (2) James Barlow.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 April 2005
Time: PM
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

44

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

I question James Barlow about the wording of Claim 44, stating that it was unclear as to how functioning as a motor caused functioning as a generator.

James Barlow stressed his opinion, that I was miss-reading the claim, stating that the claim set forth different operational modes the unit could run in; namely as a motor, as a generator or in an unloaded mode. James Barlow suggested the claim language, while not perfect was satisfactory and did not warrant any changes.

I agreed with James Barlow.